arXiv:1607.05718v1 [math.NT] 19 Jul 2016

On two questions about restricted sumsets in finite abelian groups

Béla Bajnok

Department of Mathematics, Gettysburg College
300 N. Washington Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325-1486 USA
E-mail: bbajnok@gettysburg.edu

and

Samuel Edwards

Department of Mathematics, Gettysburg College
300 N. Washington Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325-1486 USA
E-mail: edwasa01@gettysburg.edu

July 19, 2016

Abstract

Let G be an abelian group of finite order n, and let h be a positive integer. A subset A of G is called *weakly h-incomplete*, if not every element of G can be written as the sum of h distinct elements of A; in particular, if A does not contain h distinct elements that add to zero, then A is called *weakly h-zero-sum-free*. We investigate the maximum size of weakly h-incomplete and weakly h-zero-sum-free sets in G, denoted by $C_h(G)$ and $Z_h(G)$, respectively. Among our results are the following: (i) If G is of odd order and $(n-1)/2 \leq h \leq n-2$, then $C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h+1$, unless G is an elementary abelian 3-group and $h = n-3$; (ii) If G is an elementary abelian 2-group and $n/2 \leq h \leq n-2$, then $C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h+2$, unless $h = n-4$.

Keywords: Finite abelian group, elementary abelian group, sumset, restricted sumset, incomplete subset, zero-sum-free subset.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 11B13; Secondary: 05A17, 11B75, 11P99.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, G denotes a finite abelian group of order $n \geq 2$, written in additive notation. As is well known, G has a unique *invariant decomposition*: that is, it can be written uniquely as the direct product of nontrivial cyclic terms with the order of each term dividing the order of the next; we let q and r denote the *exponent* (the order of the last term) and *rank* (the number of terms) of G, respectively. If G is *cyclic*, we identify it with $\mathbb{Z}_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$; more generally, if G is *homocyclic*, we write $G = \mathbb{Z}_q^r$. We let L denote the subset consisting of the identity element of G as well as of all involutions in G: that is, L contains all elements of G of order 1 or 2. Note that L is a subgroup of G; in fact, L is isomorphic to the elementary abelian 2-group whose rank equals the number of even-order terms in the invariant decomposition of G.

For a subset A of G we let $|A|$ denote the size of A and $s(A)$ denote the sum of the elements of A. For a positive integer h, the (unrestricted) *h-fold sumset* of A, denoted by hA, is the collection of all elements of G that can be written as the sum of h (not necessarily distinct) elements of A, and the *h-fold restricted sumset* of A, denoted by $h\hat{}A$, consists of the elements of G that can be written as the sum of h distinct elements of A.

Many questions in additive combinatorics focus on properties of sumsets; for example: How large can a subset of G be without its sumset yielding all of G? While the answer to this question is solved for unrestricted sumsets (see Theorem 6 below), we know much less about restricted sumsets. The two questions we address in this paper are as follows:

- How large can a subset A of G be if $h\hat{}A \neq G$?
- How large can a subset A of G be if $0 \notin h\hat{}A$?

In particular, we are interested in finding the quantities

$$C_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, h\hat{}A \neq G\}$$

and

$$Z_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, 0 \notin h\hat{}A\}.$$

We say that a subset A of G is *weakly h-incomplete* if $h\hat{}A \neq G$ and that A is *weakly h-zero-sum-free* if $0 \notin h\hat{}A$.

These questions can be traced back to the paper [6] of Erdős and Heilbronn, and variations have been investigated by several authors, including Balandraud [4]; Gao and Geroldinger [7]; Lev [10]; Nguyen, Szemerédi, and Vu [11]; and Nguyen and Vu [12]. (The terms 'h-incomplete' and 'h-zero-sum-free' have been used in the literature, though we added the word 'weakly' to signify the fact that we are considering restricted sumsets.)

One particularly well-researched special case is the problem of finding the largest weakly 3-zero-sum-free sets in the elementary abelian 3-group $\mathbb{Z}_3^r$, as it corresponds to *cap sets* in affine geometry; see [8] by Gao and Thangadurai and its references for $r \leq 5$ and [13] by Potechin for the case $r = 6$. The fact that $Z_3(\mathbb{Z}_3^r)$ is only known for $r \leq 6$ cautions us about the extreme difficulty of these questions; in his blog [15], Tao writes "Perhaps my favourite open question is the problem on the maximal size of a cap set."

At the present time, the only type of group for which $Z_h(G)$ and $C_h(G)$ are known for every value of h is the cyclic group of prime order, and this is due to the fact this is the only case when tight lower bounds for the size of h-fold restricted sumsets are known. Namely, solving a thirty-year open question of Erdős and Heilbronn, in 1994 Dias Da Silva and Hamidoune [5] proved that in the cyclic group of prime order p, for any nonempty subset A and positive integer $h \leq |A|$ we have

$$|h\hat{}A| \geq \min\{p, h|A| - h^2 + 1\}.$$

(Soon after, Alon, Nathanson, and Ruzsa provided a different proof; cf. [1] and [2].) The fact that this bound is tight can be seen by realizing that equality holds when A is an interval (or, more generally, an arithmetic progression): one can readily verify that if A is an interval of size m in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ (with $m \geq h$), then $h\hat{}A$ is an interval of size $\min\{p, hm - h^2 + 1\}$. Consequently, in $\mathbb{Z}_p$, the maximum size of a weakly h-incomplete set is given by the largest integer m for which $hm - h^2 + 1$ is less than p, or $m = \lfloor (p-2)/h \rfloor + h$. Furthermore, for this value of m, assuming also that $h < p$, we can choose an interval A in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ of size m for which the interval $h\hat{}A$ avoids zero. Therefore, we have the following:

Theorem 1 *For any prime p and positive integer $h \leq p-1$ we have*

$$C_h(\mathbb{Z}_p) = Z_h(\mathbb{Z}_p) = \lfloor (p-2)/h \rfloor + h.$$

We make the following observation: When

$$(p-1)/2 \leq h \leq p-2,$$

then $\lfloor (p-2)/h \rfloor = 1$, and thus

$$C_h(\mathbb{Z}_p) = Z_h(\mathbb{Z}_p) = h + 1.$$

One goal of this paper is to prove that the same equations hold in almost every group of odd order. Namely, we prove the following: If G is a group of odd order n that is not an elementary abelian 3-group, and h is an integer with

$$(n-1)/2 \leq h \leq n-2,$$

then

$$C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h + 1.$$

More generally:

Theorem 2 *Let G be an abelian group of order n and exponent q, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions L has order l. Then for every integer h with*

$$(n+l)/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n-2,$$

we have

$$C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h + 1,$$

with the following two exceptions:

- *If $h = n - 3$ and $q = 3$, then $C_h(G) = h + 1$ and $Z_h(G) = h$.*
- *If $h = n - 2$, $l = 2$, and $q \equiv 2$ mod 4, then $C_h(G) = h + 1$ and $Z_h(G) = h$.*

Note that Theorem 2 is vacuous if (and only if) G is an elementary abelian 2-group; for this case we have the following result:

Theorem 3 *Let G be an elementary abelian 2-group of order $n = 2^r$, and suppose that h is an integer with*

$$n/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n - 2.$$

Then

$$C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h + 2,$$

except when $h = n - 4$, in which case $C_h(G) = h + 2$ and $Z_h(G) = h$.

Given our theorems above—as well as related results such as those in [11] by Nguyen, Szemerédi, and Vu—we may get the impression that $C_h(G)$ and $Z_h(G)$ are usually equal or that at least they are close to one another. The following example shows that, actually, $C_h(G)$ and $Z_h(G)$ may be arbitrarily far from one another.

We say that an m-subset A of G is a *weak Sidon set* in G, if $2\hat{}A$ has size exactly $\binom{m}{2}$; in other words, if no element of G can be written as a sum of two distinct elements of A in more than one way (not counting the order of the terms). Weak Sidon sets were introduced and studied by Ruzsa in [14]; though the same concept under the name "well spread set" was investigated earlier; cf. [9].

Proposition 4 *Let G be an elementary abelian 2-group. Then a subset A of G is weakly 4-zero-sum-free if, and only if, it is a weak Sidon set.*

Proof: Let us suppose first that A is weakly 4-zero-sum-free in G, and that $a_1 + a_2 = a_3 + a_4$ for some elements a_1, a_2, a_3, and a_4 of A with $a_1 \neq a_2$ and $a_3 \neq a_4$. We then have

$$a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 = 0,$$

which can only happen if the four terms are not pairwise distinct. By our assumption, this leads to $\{a_1, a_2\} = \{a_3, a_4\}$, which proves that A is a weak Sidon set in G. The other direction is similar. □

According to Proposition 4, if A is a weakly 4-zero-sum-free subset of size m in an elementary abelian 2-group G of order $n = 2^r$, then

$$\binom{m}{2} \leq n.$$

On the other hand, we clearly have $C_4(G) \geq n/2$. This yields the following result:

Proposition 5 *Let G be an elementary abelian 2-group of rank r. We then have*

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} (C_4(G) - Z_4(G)) = \infty.$$

2 Weakly h-incomplete sets

In this section we study the function

$$C_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, h\hat{}A \neq G\};$$

but first, we must mention that the related quantity

$$c_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, hA \neq G\}$$

has been completely determined in [3]. The result can be stated as follows:

Theorem 6 (Bajnok; cf. [3]) *For any abelian group G of order n and for every positive integer h, we have*

$$c_h(G) = \max\left\{(\lfloor (d-2)/h \rfloor + 1) \cdot n/d\right\},$$

where the maximum is taken over all divisors d of n.

Observe that—unlike $C_h(G)$—the value of $c_h(G)$ depends only on the order n of G and not on its structure.

Below, we will employ the fact that $c_h(G)$ is known in the case when G has even order. Namely, by letting

$$f_h(d) = (\lfloor (d-2)/h \rfloor + 1) \cdot n/d,$$

we see that $f_h(1) = 0$, $f_h(2) = n/2$, and for $d \geq 3$, we get

$$f_h(d) \leq ((d-2)/h + 1) \cdot n/d = ((h-2)/d + 1) \cdot n/h \leq ((h-2)/3 + 1) \cdot n/h \leq n/2.$$

Therefore, we have the following:

Corollary 7 *For any abelian group G of even order n and for every integer $h \geq 2$, we have $c_h(G) = n/2$.*

Let us now turn to the function $C_h(G)$. These values are easy to find for $h = 1$, $h = n-1$, and $h = n$:

Proposition 8 *For any abelian group G of order n we have $C_1(G) = n - 1$, $C_{n-1}(G) = n - 1$, and $C_n(G) = n$.*

Proof: Each of these claims is quite obvious; for example, to see that $C_{n-1}(G) = n - 1$, note that for any subset A of G of size $n - 1$, $(n-1)\hat{}A$ consists of a single element, and, on the other hand, $(n-1)\hat{}G = G$, since for each $g \in G$ we have $s(G \setminus \{s(G) - g\}) = g$. □

Next, we establish $C_h(G)$ for $h = 2$:

Theorem 9 *Let G be an abelian group of order n, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions has order l. We then have $C_2(G) = (n + l)/2$.*

Proof: First, we prove that $C_2(G) \geq (n+l)/2$ by finding a subset A of G with

$$|A| = (n+l)/2$$

for which $2\hat{}A \neq G$. Observe that the elements of $G \setminus L$ are distinct from their inverses, so we have a (possibly empty) subset K of $G \setminus L$ with which

$$G = L \cup K \cup (-K),$$

and L, K, and $-K$ are pairwise disjoint. Now set $A = L \cup K$. Clearly, A has the right size; furthermore, it is easy to verify that $0 \notin 2\hat{}A$ and thus $2\hat{}A \neq G$.

To prove that $C_2(G) \leq (n+l)/2$, we need to prove that for every subset A of G of size larger than $(n+l)/2$, we have $2\hat{}A = G$. Since this trivially holds when $L = G$, we assume that $L \neq G$.

To continue, we need the following lemma.

Claim: For a given $g \in G$, let $L_g = \{x \in G \mid 2x = g\}$. If $L_g \neq \emptyset$, then $|L_g| = l$.

Proof of Claim: Choose an element $x \in L_g$. Then, for every $y \in L_g$, we have $2(x-y) = 0$, and thus $x - y \in L$. Therefore, $x - L_g \subseteq L$, so $|x - L_g| = |L_g| \leq l$. Similarly, $x + L \subseteq L_g$, so $|x + L| = l \leq |L_g|$. This proves our claim.

Now let $m = (n+l)/2 + 1$. Note that our assumption on G implies that $3 \leq m \leq n$.

Let A be an m-subset of G, let $g \in G$ be arbitrary, and set $B = g - A$. Then $|B| = m$, and thus

$$|A \cap B| = |A| + |B| - |A \cup B| \geq 2m - n = l + 2.$$

By our claim, we must have an element $a_1 \in A \cap B$ for which $a_1 \notin L_g$. Since $a_1 \in A \cap B$, we also have an element $a_2 \in A$ for which $a_1 = g - a_2$ and thus $g = a_1 + a_2$. But $a_1 \notin L_g$, and therefore $a_2 \neq a_1$. In other words, $g \in 2\hat{}A$; since g was arbitrary, we have $G = 2\hat{}A$, as claimed. □

The value of $C_3(G)$ is not known in general and is, in fact, the subject of active interest—see [3]. Here we present the result for elementary abelian 2-groups:

Theorem 10 *If G is the elementary abelian 2-group of order $n = 2^r$, then $C_3(G) = n/2+1$.*

Proof: Let H be a subgroup of index 2 in G, select an arbitrary element $g \in G \setminus H$, and let $A = H \cup \{g\}$. Clearly, $g \notin 3\hat{}H$; furthermore, since no two distinct elements of H add to zero, we have $g \notin 3\hat{}A$. Therefore, $C_3(G) \geq n/2 + 1$.

Now let B be a subset of G of size $n/2+2$; we need to show that $3\hat{}B = G$. (This part of our argument is based on the proof of Theorem 1 in [10].) Suppose, indirectly, that this is not so. Let $g \in G \setminus 3\hat{}B$, and $C = (g+B) \setminus \{0\}$. Since $|C| = |B| - 1 = n/2+1$, by Corollary 7, we must have $3C = G$, in particular, $0 \in 3C$. Therefore, we have elements c_1, c_2, and c_3 that add to 0, and thus elements b_1, b_2, and b_3 in B for which

$$(g + b_1) + (g + b_2) + (g + b_3) = 0.$$

But $2g = 0$ in G, so we get $g = b_1 + b_2 + b_3$. Since $g \in G \setminus 3\hat{}B$, this can only happen if two of b_1, b_2, or b_3, say b_1 and b_2, equal each other. Therefore, $b_1 + b_2 = 0$, so $g = b_3$, and thus $g + b_3 = 0$. But this is a contradiction, since $0 \notin C$. □

Regarding the general case, we present an immediate lower bound for $C_h(G)$. Observe that, if A is any subset of size $h+1$ in G, then $h\hat{}A$ has size $h+1$ as well. This yields:

Proposition 11 *For any abelian group G of order n and for every positive integer $h \leq n-2$, we have $C_h(G) \geq h+1$.*

We are now ready to establish our results for $C_h(G)$ for 'large' h. The following lemma will prove useful.

Lemma 12 *Let G be a finite abelian group, and suppose that m and h are integers for which*

$$C_{h+1}(G) \leq m \leq C_h(G).$$

Then $C_{m-h}(G) = m$.

Proof: Since $m \leq C_h(G)$, there exists a subset A of G of size m for which $h\hat{}A \neq G$. But $(m-h)\hat{}A$ and $h\hat{}A$ have the same size, so we must have $(m-h)\hat{}A \neq G$ as well, and thus $C_{m-h}(G) \geq m$.

Now let B be any subset of G of size $m+1$; we need to prove that $(m-h)\hat{}B = G$. Since $(m-h)\hat{}B$ and $(h+1)\hat{}B$ have the same size, we can show that $(h+1)\hat{}B = G$ instead. Since that follows from $C_{h+1}(G) \leq m$, our proof is complete. □

According to the following result, our lower bound of Proposition 11 is actually exact when h is 'large':

Theorem 13 *Let G be an abelian group of order n, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions has order l. Then for every integer h with*

$$(n+l)/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n-2,$$

we have $C_h(G) = h+1$.

Proof: Our claim follows from Proposition 8, Theorem 9, and Lemma 12, since

$$C_2(G) = (n+l)/2 \leq h+1 \leq n-1 = C_1(G).$$

□

We should point out that, when the order of G is odd, then $L = \{0\}$, so we have $C_h(G) = h+1$ for all $(n-1)/2 \leq h \leq n-2$. More generally, when $L \neq G$, then, since L is a subgroup of G, $(n+l)/2$ is at most $3n/4$, so Theorem 13 establishes the function $C_h(G)$ for at least when $h \in [3n/4, n-2]$. However, Theorem 13 is void when $L = G$; in this case we have the following two results:

Theorem 14 *Suppose that G is the elementary abelian 2-group of order $n = 2^r$.*

1. *For each integer h with $n/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n - 2$, we have $C_h(G) = h + 2$.*
2. *For each integer h with $4 \leq h \leq n/2 - 2$, we have*

$$n/2 \leq C_h(G) \leq n/2 + h - 2.$$

Proof: Our first claim follows from Theorem 9, Theorem 10, and Lemma 12, since

$$C_3(G) = n/2 + 1 \leq h + 2 \leq n = C_2(G).$$

The first inequality of the second claim follows from Corollary 7, since $c_h(G) \leq C_h(G)$. To prove the second inequality, let A be a subset of G of size $n/2 + h - 1$. Let us fix a subset B of A of size $h - 3$, and let $C = A \setminus B$. Then C has size $n/2 + 2$, so $3\hat{}C = G$ by Theorem 10, and thus $(h-3)\hat{}B + 3\hat{}C = G$ as well. But $(h-3)\hat{}B + 3\hat{}C \subseteq h\hat{}A$, so $h\hat{}A = G$, which proves our claim. □

3 Zero-sum sets of given size

In this section we develop some results that lay the groundwork for our study of $Z_h(G)$ in Section 4. We believe these results are of independent interest.

We start with the following easy lemma.

Lemma 15 *Suppose that G is a finite abelian group with L as the subgroup of involutions; let $|L| = l$.*

1. *If $l = 2$ with $L = \{0, e\}$, then the sum $s(G)$ of the elements of G equals e.*
2. *If $l \neq 2$, then $s(G) = 0$.*

Proof: Recall that L is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, hence $s(L) = 0$, unless $l = 2$, in which case $s(L)$ equals the unique element of order 2. Our claims follow from the fact that we have $s(G) = s(L)$. □

We now classify all positive integers m for which one can find m nonzero elements in a given abelian group G that add to 0. We separate the cases when G is an elementary abelian 2-group and when it is not.

Theorem 16 *Let G be the elementary abelian 2-group of order $n = 2^r$, and let m be a positive integer. Then $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of size m if, and only if, $3 \leq m \leq n - 4$ or $m = n - 1$.*

Proof: For a given positive integer k, let $M(k)$ denote the set of nonnegative integers m for which $\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of size m. We start by stating and proving three easy claims about $M(k)$.

Claim 1: Suppose that $k \geq 2$. We then have $m \in M(k)$ if, and only if, $2^k - 1 - m \in M(k)$.

Proof of Claim 1: Observe that by Lemma 15, $s(\mathbb{Z}_2^k) = 0$, and thus $s(\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}) = 0$. Therefore, for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$s(A) = s((\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}) \setminus A),$$

from which our claim follows.

Claim 2: If $m \in M(k)$ for some positive integer $k \geq 2$, then $m \in M(k+1)$.

Proof of Claim 2: Clearly, if A is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}$ of size m with $s(A) = 0$, then $B = \{0\} \times A$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}$ of size m with $s(B) = 0$.

Claim 3: Let k and l be integers so that $2 \leq l \leq k$. If $m \in M(k)$, then $m + 2^l \in M(k+1)$.

Proof of Claim 3: As in the proof of Claim 2, if A is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}$ of size m with $s(A) = 0$, then $B = \{0\} \times A$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}$ of size m with $s(B) = 0$.

Let H be a subgroup of order 2^l in $\mathbb{Z}_2^k$. Then $C = \{1\} \times H$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}$ of size 2^l with $s(C) = 0$. Therefore, $B \cup C \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}$ has size $m + 2^l$ and $s(B \cup C) = 0$, and thus $m + 2^l \in M(k+1)$, as claimed.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 16. Suppose that G has rank $r \geq 2$; we need to prove that

$$M(r) = \{0\} \cup \{3, 4, \ldots, 2^r - 4\} \cup \{2^r - 1\}.$$

We trivially have $0 \in M(r)$ and $1 \notin M(r)$. Furthermore, $2 \notin M(r)$ follows from the fact that each element of $\mathbb{Z}_2^r$ is its own inverse. By Claim 1, we then have $2^r - 3 \notin M(r)$, $2^r - 2 \notin M(r)$, and $2^r - 1 \in M(r)$.

Assume now that $3 \leq m \leq 2^r - 4$; we need to prove that $m \in M(r)$. Our assumption implies that $r \geq 3$; we verify our claim for $r = 3$ and $r = 4$, then proceed by induction.

Recall that $2^r - 1 \in M(r)$ for each $r \geq 2$; in particular, $3 \in M(2)$ and $7 \in M(3)$. Therefore, by Claim 2, we have $3 \in M(3)$, $3 \in M(4)$, and $7 \in M(4)$. Furthermore, $3 \in M(3)$ implies that $4 \in M(3)$ by Claim 1, and thus $4 \in M(4)$ by Claim 2. By Claim 1, we then also have $\{8, 11, 12\} \subseteq M(4)$. This completes the case of $r = 3$, and leaves only $m = 5, 6, 9, 10$ to be verified for $r = 4$; by Claim 1, it suffices to do this for $m = 5$ and $m = 6$.

For $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we let e_i denote the element of $\mathbb{Z}_2^4$ with a 1 in the i-th position and 0 everywhere else. Then the sets

$$\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_1 + e_2 + e_3 + e_4\}$$

and

$$\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_1 + e_2, e_3 + e_4\}$$

show that $5 \in M(4)$ and $6 \in M(4)$. This completes our claim for $r = 4$.

Suppose now that $k \geq 4$ and $m \in M(k)$ for every $3 \leq m \leq 2^k - 4$; we will show that $m \in M(k+1)$ for every $3 \leq m \leq 2^{k+1} - 4$. For $3 \leq m \leq 2^k - 4$, this follows from Claim 2. Since $k \geq 4$, we have $3 \leq 2^k - 7$, so $2^k - 7 \in M(k)$, and thus $2^k - 3 \in M(k+1)$ by Claim 3; similarly, $2^k - 2 \in M(k+1)$ and $2^k - 1 \in M(k+1)$. Therefore, $m \in M(k+1)$ for every $3 \leq k \leq 2^k - 1$, and thus $m \in M(k+1)$ for every $2^k \leq m \leq 2^{k+1} - 4$ as well by Claim 1. This completes our proof. $\square$

Theorem 17 *Let G be an abelian group of order n that is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group. Suppose that the subgroup of involutions in G has order l, and let m be a positive integer. Then $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of size m if, and only if, one of the following conditions holds:*

- $2 \leq m \leq n-3$*;*
- $m = n-2$ *and* $l = 2$*; or*
- $m = n-1$ *and* $l \neq 2$.

Proof: We may clearly assume that $2 \leq m \leq n-1$. Let us write $\mathrm{Ord}(G,2) = L \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$G = \{0\} \cup \mathrm{Ord}(G,2) \cup K \cup -K,$$

where the four components are pairwise disjoint and, since G is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, K and $-K$ are nonempty. We examine three cases.

Case 1: $l = 1$.

In this case, q and n are odd, and $\mathrm{Ord}(G,2) = \emptyset$, and thus $G \setminus \{0\} = K \cup -K$. Clearly, $G \setminus \{0\}$ clearly contains a zero-sum subset of every even size $m \leq n-1$. Furthermore, we see that $G \setminus \{0\}$ does not have a zero-sum set of size $n-2$. It remains to be shown that $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every odd size $3 \leq m \leq n-4$.

If $n = 7$, then the set $\{1,2,4\}$ proves our claim, so let us assume that $n \geq 9$ or, equivalently, that $|K| \geq 4$. Let g_1 be any element of K; since $|K| \geq 4$, we can find another element $g_2 \in K$ so that $g_2 \neq -2g_1$ and $g_2 \neq \frac{q-1}{2} g_1$.

We first prove that the six elements $\pm g_1, \pm g_2$, and $\pm(g_1+g_2)$ are pairwise distinct. Indeed, g_1 and g_2 are distinct elements of K, so $-g_1$ and $-g_2$ are distinct elements of $-K$. So $g_1 + g_2 \neq 0$, and thus one of g_1+g_2 or $-(g_1+g_2)$ is an element of K and the other is an element of $-K$. If g_1+g_2 is in K, then it must be distinct from both g_1 and g_2, since neither of these is 0, and so $-(g_1+g_2)$ is distinct from $-g_1$ and $-g_2$ as well. Furthermore, if g_1+g_2 is in $-K$, then it must be distinct from $-g_1$ since $g_2 \neq -2g_1$, and if it were equal to $-g_2$, then we would get $2g_2 = -g_1$, so $\frac{q+1}{2} \cdot 2g_2 = \frac{q+1}{2} \cdot (-g_1)$, that is, $g_2 = \frac{q-1}{2} g_1$, which we ruled out.

Therefore, we are able to partition G as

$$G = \{0\} \cup \{\pm g_1, \pm g_2, \pm(g_1+g_2)\} \cup K' \cup -K',$$

where $K' \subset K$ and $|K'| = (n-7)/2$. Note that $(m-3)/2 \leq |K'|$; let $K_1 \subseteq K'$ of size $(m-3)/2$. Then

$$A = \{g_1, g_2, -(g_1+g_2)\} \cup K_1 \cup -K_1$$

has size m and its elements sum to 0.

Case 2: $l = 2$.

In this case, q is even and n/q is odd, and $|\mathrm{Ord}(G,2)| = 1$. Let $\mathrm{Ord}(G,2) = \{e\}$; we then have

$$G = \{0\} \cup \{e\} \cup K \cup -K.$$

Clearly, $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every even size $m \leq n-2$; we consider odd values of m next.

The case of $m = n-1$ is settled by the fact that the elements of $G \setminus \{0\}$ add up to e by Lemma 15. Next, we consider $m = n-3$, in which case we are looking for a set A of the form

$$A = G \setminus \{0, g_1, g_2\}$$

whose elements add to 0. Now $m \geq 3$, so $n \geq 6$, and since q is even and n/q is odd, we then must have $q \geq 6$ as well. Let g_1 be any element of G of order q, and let $g_2 = e - g_1$. Then g_1 and g_2 are distinct nonzero elements of G, since $g_1 = g_2$ would imply that g_1 has order at most 4. Thus A satisfies our requirements.

This leaves us with the cases of odd m values with $3 \leq m \leq n-5$. If $n = 8$, then our assumptions imply that G is cyclic, in which case the set $\{1, 3, 4\}$ satisfies our claim. If $n \geq 10$, then $|K| \geq 4$, so this case can be handled as in Case 1 above.

Case 3: $l > 2$.

In this case, q and n/q are even, and $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| > 1$. Note that the elements of G, and thus the elements of $G \setminus \{0\}$, sum to 0; this settles the cases of $m = n-1$ and $m = n-2$. We need to show that a zero-sum subset of $G \setminus \{0\}$ of size m exists for every $2 \leq m \leq n-3$.

Recall that L is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, so $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)|$ is 1 less than a power of 2; so, by assumption, it equals 3 or is at least 7.

Suppose first that $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| = 3$. Since the three elements of $\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)$ add to 0, $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every odd size $3 \leq m \leq 3 + 2|K| = n-1$. Clearly, $G \setminus \{0\}$ also contains a zero-sum subset of every even size $3 \leq m \leq 2|K| = n-4$ as well, completing this case.

Suppose now that $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| \geq 7$. By Theorem 16, $\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)$, and thus $G \setminus \{0\}$, contains a zero-sum subset of size m for every $2 \leq m \leq |\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| - 3$. If $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| - 2 \leq m \leq n-4$, then we may write m as $m = m_1 + 2k_1$, with $0 \leq k_1 \leq |K|$ and $m_1 = |\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| - 3$ (if m is even) or $m_1 = |\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| - 4$ (if m is odd). Therefore, $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every size m with $2 \leq m \leq n-4$. Finally, if $m = n-3$, then $m = |\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| + 2(|K| - 1)$, so again $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of size m. This completes our proof. □

Corollary 18 *Let G be an abelian group of order n. Suppose that the subgroup of involutions in G has order l, and let m be a positive integer with $m \leq n$. Then G contains a zero-sum subset of size m with the following exceptions:*

- *G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group and $m \in \{2, n-2\}$; or*
- *$l = 2$ and $m = n$.*

Proof: The claim is trivial for $m = 1$, and is a restatement of Lemma 15 if $m = n$. If G and m are such that $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum set A of size m or $m-1$, then either A or $A \cup \{0\}$ satisfies our claim. By Theorems 16 and 17, this leaves only the case when G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group and $m = 2$ or $m = n-2$, for which the claim follows from the fact that each element is its own inverse then. □

Corollary 19 *Let G be an abelian group of order n. Suppose that the subgroup of involutions in G has order l, and let m be a positive integer. Then G contains a subset A of size m for which $s(A) \notin A$ if, and only if, one of the following conditions holds:*

- $2 \leq m \leq n-4$*;*
- $m = n-3$ *and G is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group;*
- $m = n-2$ *and G is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 3-group; or*
- $m = n-1$ *and $l \neq 2$; or $m = n-1$, $l = 2$, and q is divisible by 4.*

Proof: We can clearly assume that $2 \leq m \leq n-1$, and by Theorems 16 and 17, it suffices to consider the following cases:

(i) $m = n-3$ and G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group;

(ii) $m = n-2$ and $l \neq 2$; and

(iii) $m = n-1$, $l = 2$.

If $m = n-3$ and G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, then an m-set A with $s(A) \notin A$ exists if, and only if, we can find distinct elements a_1, a_2, and a_3 in G for which $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \in \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. This is not possible, since two distinct elements do not add to 0.

The cases to be considered for $m = n-2$ are exactly those where, by Lemma 15, $s(G) = 0$. Therefore, an m-set A with $s(A) \notin A$ exists if, and only if, we can find distinct elements a_1 and a_2 in G for which $-a_1 - a_2 \in \{a_1, a_2\}$, that is, $a_2 \neq -2a_1$ or $a_1 \neq -2a_2$. This is possible exactly when G has an element whose order is not a divisor of 3.

Finally, suppose that $m = n-1$ and $l = 2$. In this case, by Lemma 15, $s(G) = e$ where e is the unique element of G of order 2. Therefore, an m-set A with $s(A) \notin A$ exists if, and only if, G contains an element a for which $2a = e$, which is possible exactly when q is divisible by 4. □

4 Weakly h-zero-sum-free sets

We start by determining

$$Z_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, 0 \notin h\hat{}A\}$$

for $h = 1, 2, n-1$, and n.

Proposition 20 *Let G be an abelian group of order n, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions has order l. We have*

1. $Z_1(G) = n-1$*;*

2. $Z_2(G) = (n+l)/2$;

3. $Z_{n-1}(G) = n-1$;

4. $Z_n(G) = n$ *when* $l = 2$, *and* $Z_n(G) = n-1$ *when* $l \neq 2$.

Proof: The first claim is trivial, since $G \setminus \{0\}$ is weakly 1-zero-sum-free. Let us write $G = L \cup K \cup (-K)$. Clearly, $A = L \cup K$ is weakly 2-zero-sum-free. On the other hand, if B has size more than $(n+l)/2$, then it contains at least $(n-l)/2 + 1 = |K| + 1$ elements of $K \cup (-K)$, so it is not weakly 2-zero-sum-free.

To prove that $Z_{n-1}(G) = n-1$, let $g = s(G)$. Then $s(G \setminus \{g\}) = 0$, so $Z_{n-1}(G) \leq n-1$. But for every element $g' \in G \setminus \{g\}$, we have $s(G \setminus \{g'\}) = g - g' \neq 0$, so $Z_{n-1}(G) \geq n-1$. Our last claim follows from Lemma 15. □

We can easily establish the following lower bound:

Proposition 21 *For any abelian group G of order n and all positive integers $h \leq n-1$ we have $Z_h(G) \geq h$.*

Proof: Let A be any subset of G of size h. If $s(A) \neq 0$, we are done. Otherwise, choose elements $a \in A$ and $b \in G \setminus A$. Then for $B = (A \setminus \{a\}) \cup \{b\}$ we have $|B| = h$ and

$$s(B) = s(A) - a + b = b - a \neq 0.$$

□

Next, we present a necessary and sufficient condition for $Z_h(G)$ to be at least $h+1$:

Proposition 22 *Let G be a finite abelian group and h be a positive integer with $h \leq n-1$. Then $Z_h(G) \geq h+1$ if, and only if, there exists a subset A in G of size $h+1$ for which $s(A) \notin A$.*

Proof: Suppose first that A is a subset of G of size $h+1$ for which $s(A) \notin A$; we prove that A is weakly h-zero-sum-free in G. Let B be any subset of size h of A, and let a be the element of A for which $B = A \setminus \{a\}$. Then $s(B) = s(A) - a$; since $s(A) \notin A$, we have $s(B) \neq 0$, as claimed. Therefore, $Z_h(G) \geq h+1$.

Conversely, assume that all subsets of G of size $h+1$ contain their sum as an element. Let A be any subset of G of size $h+1$. By assumption, $s(A) \in A$; let $B = A \setminus \{s(A)\}$. Then B has size h and $s(B) = 0$, so A is not weakly h-zero-sum-free in G. Therefore, $Z_h(G) \leq h$. □

Our next two results establish the value of $Z_h(G)$ for all 'large' h. First, we consider groups with exponent at least three:

Theorem 23 *Let G be an abelian group of order n that is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions has order l. For every integer h with*

$$(n+l)/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n-2,$$

we have

$$Z_h(G) = \begin{cases} h & \text{if } h = n-3 \text{ and } q = 3; \text{ or} \\ & h = n-2,\ l = 2, \text{ and } q \equiv 2 \bmod 4; \\ h+1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof: By Proposition 21 and Theorem 13, we have

$$h \leq Z_h(G) \leq h+1.$$

Thus our claim follows from Proposition 22 and Corollary 19. □

For groups of exponent two, we have the following result:

Theorem 24 *Suppose that G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group and has order $n = 2^r$, and let h be an integer with $n/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n-2$. We then have*

$$Z_h(G) = \begin{cases} h & \text{if } h = n-4; \\ h+2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof: By Proposition 21 and Theorem 14, we have

$$h \leq Z_h(G) \leq h+2.$$

Therefore, our result will follow from the following two claims.

Claim 1: If h is a positive integer with $h \leq n-2$ and $h \neq h-4$, then $Z_h(G) \geq h+2$.

Proof of Claim 1: Let $m = h+2$; we then have $3 \leq m \leq n$ with $m \neq n-2$. Thus, by Corollary 18, G contains an m-subset A with $s(A) = 0$; we will prove that A is weakly h-zero-sum-free in G. Let B be any h-subset of A; we assume that $B = A \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$. Since a_1 and a_2 are distinct, we have $a_1 + a_2 \neq 0$, and therefore

$$s(B) = s(A) - (a_1 + a_2) = a_1 + a_2 \neq 0.$$

This proves our claim.

Claim 2: We have $Z_{n-4}(G) \leq n-4$.

Proof of Claim 2: Suppose that A is an arbitrary subset of G with $|A| = n-3$; we let $A = G \setminus \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. Note that a_1, a_2, and a_3 are pairwise distinct, so no two of them add to zero, and thus $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \in A$. Let $B = A \setminus \{a_1 + a_2 + a_3\}$. We then have

$$s(B) = s(A) - (a_1 + a_2 + a_3),$$

where

$$s(A) = s(G) - (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) = a_1 + a_2 + a_3.$$

Thus $s(B) = 0$, which proves our claim. □

References

[1] N. Alon, M. B. Nathanson, and I. Ruzsa, Adding Distinct Congruence Classes Modulo a Prime, *Am. Math. Monthly*, **102** (1995) 250–255.

[2] N. Alon, M. B. Nathanson, and I. Ruzsa, The Polynomial Method and Restricted Sums of Congruence Classes, *J. Number Theory*, **56** (1996) 404–417.

[3] B. Bajnok, The h-critical number of finite Abelian groups. *Unif. Distrib. Theory* **10** (2015), no. 2, 93–115.

[4] É. Balandraud, An addition theorem and maximal zero-sum free sets in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **188** (2012) 405–429. Erratum, **192**:2 (2012) 1009–1010.

[5] J. A. Dias Da Silva and Y. o. Hamidoune, Cyclic space for Grassmann derivatives and additive theory. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, **26** (1994) 140–146.

[6] P. Erdős and H. Heilbronn, On the addition of residue classes mod p. *Acta Arith.*, **9** (1964) 149–159.

[7] W. Gao and A. Geroldinger, Zero-sum problems in finite abelian groups: A survey, *Expo. Math.*, **24** (2006) 337–369.

[8] W. D. Gao and R. Thangadurai, A Variant of Kemnitz Conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* **107** (2004) 69–86.

[9] A. Kotzig, On well spread sets of integers, Tech. Report CRM–161, Centre Res. Math., Université de Montréal (1972), 83pp.

[10] V. F. Lev, Three-fold restricted set addition in groups. *European J. Combin.* **23** (2002), no. 5, 613–617.

[11] N. H. Nguyen, E. Szemerédi, and V. H. Vu, Subset sums modulo a prime. *Acta Arithmetica*, **131**:4 (2008) 303–316.

[12] N. H. Nguyen and V. H. Vu, Classification theorems for sumsets modulo a prime. *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* **116** (2009) 936–959.

[13] A. Potechin, Maximal Caps in AG$(6, 3)$, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, **46** (2008) 243–259.

[14] I. Z. Ruzsa, Solving a linear equation in a set of integers I, *Acta Arith.* **65** (1993) no. 3, 259–282.

[15] T. Tao, Open question: best bounds for cap sets. Blog post https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2007/02/23/open-question-best-bounds-for-cap-sets/.